

ON CERTAIN MINOR CORRECTIONS MADE IN THE REPORT
SUBMITTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE TO THE TWELFTH INTER-
NATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY, LISBON, SEPTEMBER
1935

By Francis HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.)

When at their Fifth Meeting held at Lisbon on 18th September 1935, I laid before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature the draft of the report to be submitted by them to the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology, I pointed out that I had been greatly hampered in preparing this document through the lack of standard works of reference. So far as was possible in the circumstances, I had verified the references cited in the draft Report; but I had no doubt that in spite of this there were some errors in the bibliographical and other references cited. I hoped that the Commission would recognise that this was inevitable in the circumstances and would authorise me to examine the report from this point of view after the Congress when on my return to London I should have access to all the necessary works of reference. I asked for the authority of the Commission to correct any such errors before the text of the report was officially printed. This request was granted by the International Commission (see Official Record of Proceedings of the 5th Meeting (Lisbon Session, Conclusion 1 (c)).

On my return to London exceptional pressure of official work made it impossible for me at once to undertake the task of checking and revising the numerous references cited in the Commission's report. When, therefore, Professor Arthur Ricardo JORGE, the President of the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology, asked to be furnished with the text of the Report for inclusion in the *Compte Rendu* of the Congress which he was anxious to publish as quickly as possible, I had no option but to give him for this purpose a copy of the report in the form in which it had been prepared during the Lisbon Congress. In consequence, the report, as it appears in the *Compte Rendu* of the Congress published in 1936, is identical in every respect with the report actually submitted to, and approved by, the Congress at the Concilium Plenum held on 21st September 1935.

I have since personally verified every reference cited in the report and have corrected the errors so detected. These corrections have been inserted in the text of the report now published. In order to eliminate any possibility of subsequent misunderstanding, I have thought it right to draw attention to every correction so made by placing a number after every item so corrected. In a few cases where no correction was needed, I have thought it desirable to add short explanatory notes, each of which has been numbered in the same way. The numbers placed against names, etc., in the report correspond with the numbers allotted to the notes given below.

- (1) *Bacillus*. This name was published in the entomological portion of volume 10 of the *Encyclopédie méthodique*, Paris, 1825. This was prepared by Le Peletier de Saint Fargeau and Serville, in collaboration. The name of the first of these authors was given incorrectly in the Lisbon report as "St. Fargeau".

- (2) *Gampsocleis* Fieber. The type of this genus was correctly given in the Lisbon report as *Locusta glabra* Herbst, 1786, but the statement in the report that this species was designated as the type by Fieber in 1853 is not accurate. On the first publication of this name in 1852, Fieber gave as sole species, and therefore as the type (Article 30 (I) (c)), a species to which he applied the name *Dect[icus] maculatus* var. *glaber*. The reference is clearly to *Decticus glaber* Burmeister, 1838 (*Handb. Ent.* 2 (2) (No. 1) : 713), but, as pointed out by Sherborn (1926, *Index Anim.* (Pars secund.) : 2708), Burmeister did not publish this as a new name but as a grammatical variant of the name *Locusta glabra* Herbst.
- (3) *Eumastax* Burr. The date of *Mastax tenuis* Perty, the type of this genus, is 1832 not 1830 (see Sherborn, 1931, *Index Anim.* (Pars secund.) : 6424).
- (4) *Gryllacris* Serville. Serville placed in this genus three species: (i) *G. maculicollis* Serville; (ii) *G. ruficeps* Serville; and (iii) *G. personata* Serville. The first author to select any of these species as the type of *Gryllacris* Serville was Rehn, who in 1905 (*Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* 57 : 827) designated *G. maculicollis* Serville as the type. If, as is commonly held (e.g. by Kirby, 1906, *Syn. Cat. Orthopt.* 2 : 144), that name is a synonym of *Gryllus signifera* Stoll, 1813 (*Spectres Saut.* : 26), the first type designation of this genus is that by Chenu, 1859 (*Ency. Hist. nat. Annel.* : 66), who specified *G. signifera*, thereby automatically specifying *G. maculicollis*, one of the originally-included species. Both these designations have priority over Kirby's selection of *G. ruficeps* Serville in 1906 (*Syn. Cat. Orthopt.* 2 : 139, 143).
- (5) *Gryllotalpa* Latreille. The date of this name was given in the Lisbon report as 1802. It has since been ascertained (Griffin, 1938, *J. Soc. Bibl. nat. Hist.* 1 : 157) that volume 3 of the work of Latreille in which this name was first published should be dated [1802-1803].
- (6) *Myrmecophilus* Berthold. The date of *Blatta acervorum* Panzer, the type of this genus, should be cited in square brackets, since the Parts of Panzer's *Faun. Ins. germ.* are undated and their dates of publication can only be ascertained from external sources.
- (7) *Oedipoda*. The author of this name is Latreille and not Serville, as inadvertently stated in the Lisbon report; the date of publication is 1829 not 1831. The name was first published by Latreille in Cuvier, *Règne Anim.* (ed. 2) 5 : 188.
- (8) *Phyllium* Illiger. In the version of the Lisbon report published in 1936 (*Compte Rendu XII Congr. int. Zool.* : 189), this name, through a printer's error, was misspelt *Phyllum*.
- (9) *Prophalangopsis* Walker. The date of publication of *Tarraga obscura* Walker, the type of this genus, is 1869 not 1868 (as stated in the Lisbon report). The reference is *Cat. Dermapt. Saltat. Brit. Mus.* 1 : 100.
- (10) *Psophus* Fieber. (a) Through some misunderstanding, the name of this genus was given in the Lisbon report as *Psopha* Fieber, 1852 (i.e. Fieber, 1852, in Kelch, *Grundl. Orth. Obersches.* : 2) instead of as *Psophus* Fieber, 1853 (*Lotos* 3 : 122). This was purely an inadvertence since *Psopha* Fieber, 1852, is invalid, as it is a homonym of *Psopha* Billberg, 1828 (*Syn. Scand.* 1 (2) : tabell. A). That this was so was recognised by Fieber himself and it was for this reason that within a year of the publication of *Psopha* he replaced that name by the name *Psophus*. (b) The genus is monotypical, a fact which through some oversight was not noted in the Lisbon report.

- (11) *Proscopia* Klug. According to the information supplied to the Commission at Lisbon, the first of the originally-included species validly to be designated as the type of this genus under Article 30 of the Code was *Proscopia oculata* Klug, 1820, and this information was accepted by the Commission, subject (as in the case of all similar data) to verification after the close of the Congress (Lisbon Session, 5th Meeting, Conclusion 1 (c)). In fact, however (as pointed out by Roberts, 1941 (*Trans. amer. ent. Soc.* 67 : 20)), the first of the originally-included species to be designated as the type was *Proscopia gigantea* Klug, that species having been so designated twice before Kirby in 1910 (*Syn. Cat. Orthopt.* 3 : 83, 84) selected *Proscopia oculata* Klug as the type. The first selection of *Proscopia gigantea* Klug as the type was by Guérin, 1828 (*Dict. Class. Hist. nat.* 14 : 297); the second was by Kirby himself in 1890 (*Sci. Proc. R. Dublin Soc.* (n.s.) 6 : 586). In these circumstances, it has been necessary, under the directions given by the Commission, to substitute *Proscopia gigantea* Klug for *Proscopia oculata* Klug as the type species. This change does not affect the systematic position of the genus *Proscopia* Klug, according to modern authors (e.g. Hebard, 1924, *Trans. amer. ent. Soc.* 50 : 93 and Roberts, 1941, *ibid.* 67 : 20) who treat *Proscopia oculata* Klug and *Proscopia gigantea* Klug as congeneric.
- (12) *Tridactylus* Olivier. According to the information supplied to the Commission at Lisbon, the type of this genus was *Acheta digitata* Coquebert, 1804, that species having been so designated by "Latreille, 1804", i.e. by Latreille, [1803-1804]³⁶, (in Sonnini's Buffon), *Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins.* 12 : 120. In that work Latreille said (a) that "l'espèce d'après laquelle j'ai établi" the characters there cited for *Tridactylus* Olivier was *Tridactylus paradoxus* Latreille and (b) that the latter was the same species as *Acheta digitata* Coquebert, 1804. In actual fact, the first occasion on which any species was placed in the genus *Tridactylus* Olivier is Latreille, [1802-1803]³⁷, (in Sonnini's Buffon), *Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins.* 3 : 276, which is also the place where the name *Tridactylus paradoxus* Latreille was first published. As that species was the sole species placed by Latreille in this genus on that occasion, the genus is monotypical and *Tridactylus paradoxus* Latreille is automatically the type. Fortunately, the correction which it has in consequence been necessary to make in the Lisbon report is a purely formal one only, since *Tridactylus paradoxus* Latreille and *Acheta digitata* Coquebert are no more than different names for a single species.
- (13) *Mantis* Linnaeus. (a) Under *Opinion* 124 the subdivisions of genera by Linnaeus in the 10th edition of the *Syst. Nat.* do not rank as of sub-generic value as from that date (1758), except in any case where the International Commission by using their plenary powers to suspend the rules direct otherwise, as they did at Lisbon in the case of the name *Locusta* (Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion 18). All that the Commission did at Lisbon in the case of the name *Mantis* was to agree that it should be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names*, with standing as from the date of its first valid publication. This was in 1767 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 12) 1 (2) : 689). The date "1758" in the Lisbon report was a *lapsus calami*.

³⁶ Volume 12 is dated "An XII", the equivalent of 24th Sept. 1803-22nd Sept. 1804 (see Griffin, 1939, *J. Soc. Bibl. nat. Hist.* 1 : 249).

³⁷ The date of volume 3 is [1802-1803]. See Griffin, 1938, *J. Soc. Bibl. nat. Hist.* 1 : 157.

- (b) Linnaeus originally published the name of the type of this genus as *Gryllus religiosus* and not as *Gryllus religiosa*, the form given in the Lisbon report.
- (14) *Cephus* Latreille. (a) For a note on the date here assigned to this name, see note (5) above in regard to the name *Gryllotalpa* Latreille.
 (b) By inadvertence in the Lisbon report the generic name of the type of this genus was misspelt *Syrex* and the date of *Sirex pigmaeus* was given as 1758 instead of 1767.
- (15) *Astata* Latreille. (a) For the reasons explained in note (6) above, the date of *Tiphia abdominalis* Panzer, the type of this genus should be cited in square brackets.
 (b) The date of the work in which Latreille designated the above species as the type of this genus was given in the Lisbon report as 1802. For the reasons explained in note (5) above, the correct date is [1802–1803].
- (16) *Dryinus* Latreille. (a) This name was first published by Latreille in the *Nouvelle Dictionnaire d'Histoire naturelle* (24 (Tab.): 176), which was published in March 1804 (Griffin, 1935, in Richards, *Trans. R. ent. Soc. Lond.* 83 : 144), and not in 1805 as stated in the Lisbon report.
 (b) The name *Dryinus formicarius* Latreille was first published in Son-nini's Buffon, *Histoire naturelle, générale et particulière, des Crustacés et des Insectes* 13 : 228, which is dated "An XIII" and must therefore have been published between 23rd Sept. 1804 and 22nd Sept. 1805 (Griffin, 1939, *J. Soc. Bibl. nat. Hist.* 1 : 249). The date was given as 1805 in the Lisbon report.
 (c) No species was placed in this genus until in vol. 13 of the *Hist. nat.* Latreille cited the single species *Dryinus formicarius* Latreille. The genus is therefore monotypical and there is no reason (as was thought at Lisbon) to rely upon Latreille, 1810, for the designation of the above species as the type.
- (17) *Cryptus* Fabricius and *Cryptus viduatorius* Fabricius: the correct date for Fabricius's *Systema Piezatorum*, in which these names were first published, is [1804–1805] not 1804 (see Griffin, 1935, in Richards, *Trans. R. ent. Soc. Lond.* 83 : 144).
- (18) *Arge* Schrank. The name *Tenthredo enodis* was first published by Linnaeus in 1767 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 12) 1 (2) : 922) not 1758 as stated in the Lisbon report.
- (19) *Phaneroptera* Serville. Poda originally published the name of the type of this genus as *Gryllus falcata* and not as *Gryllus falcatus* as stated in the Lisbon report.
- (20) *Pompilus*. In paragraph 27 (a) of the Lisbon report, this name was misspelt *Pompilius* through a printer's error.
- (21) *Misocampe* Latreille. The Commission were asked at Lisbon to suppress the name "*Misocampus* Latreille, 1817" (the date "1811" in the report being due to a misprint). There is, however, no such name. There is no doubt that what was intended was the name *Misocampe* Latreille, 1818 (*Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.* (ed. 2) 21 : 213). The misunderstanding in this case is probably due (as suggested by Dr. O. W. Richards in *litt.*) to the fact that Dalla Torre, 1898 (*Cat. Hymenopt.* 5 : 297) gave for *Misocampe* Latreille the incomplete (and inexact) reference "*Misocampus* Latreille, *Nouv. dict. hist. nat.* Ed. 2^a 1817 p ?".
- (22) *Lasius* Panzer. The date of publication is [1801–1802] and not 1804 as stated in the Lisbon report. The date should be placed in square brackets for the reasons explained in note (6) above.

- (23) *Psammochares* Latreille. Through a printer's error this name was misspelt *Psammachares* in the Lisbon report.
- (24) *Ceraphron* Panzer. The date should be cited in square brackets. See note (6) above.
- (25) *Pompilus* Schneider, 1784, and *Prosopis* Fabricius, [1804–1805] were inadvertently omitted from the list given in the Lisbon report.
- (26) *Crabro* Fabricius. The oldest name for the species here designated as the type of this genus is *Vespa cribraria* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) : 573) and not *Sphex cribraria* Linnaeus, 1767, as stated in the Lisbon report.
- (27) *Lasius* Fabricius. The date of this name is [1804–1805]. See note (17) above.
- (28) *Pimpla* Fabricius. Note (27) above applies also to this name.
- (29) *Bracon* Fabricius. (a) Note (27) applies also to this name.
(b) Fabricius originally published the name of the type of this genus as *Ichneumon minutator* and not as *Bracon minutator* as inadvertently stated in the Lisbon report.
- (30) *Bethylus* Latreille. The date of publication of this name is [1802–1803] and not 1802 as stated in the Lisbon report. See note (5) above.
- (31) *Prosopis* Jurine, 1807. (a) Through some slip, the name of the type of this genus appeared in the Lisbon report as *Sphex signator* instead of *Sphex signata*.
(b) The date of publication of *Sphex signata* should be cited in square brackets. See note (6) above.
- (32) *Proctotrupes* Latreille. The date of publication of *Proctotrupes brevipennis* Latreille, the type of this genus, is [1802–1803] and not 1802 as stated in the Lisbon report. See note (5) above.
- (33) At the time of the Lisbon Session it was believed that Signatures 5 to 15 (pp. 65–240) of Hübner's *Verzeichniss bekannter Schmettlinge* [sic] were published in 1822 or 1823 (see Hemming, 1929, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (10) 3 : 219). It has since been ascertained, as the result of the discovery of the surviving Hübner manuscripts, that Signatures 3 to 7 (pp. 33–112), which alone are here concerned, were all published in 1819 (see Hemming, 1937, *Hübner* 1 : 507–509). This date should be cited in square brackets.
- (34) The dates of publication of the various portions of Cramer's *Uitlandsche Kapellen* can only be determined by reference to a copy of that work in the original wrappers as issued, since each wrapper bears the year of publication. The result of such an examination is embodied in Sherborn's *Index Animalium (Sectio prima)*, from which the date here given is taken. The dates for this work should therefore be cited in square brackets.
- (35) *Latiiorina* Tutt. This name, which was inadvertently omitted from the report, is in all respects identical with *Agriades* Hübner and the decision taken in regard to the latter name was intended to cover both names.
- (36) The date 1779 should be cited in square brackets, since the dates of publication of Bergstrasser's *Nom. Ins.* can only be determined from external sources (see Hemming, 1931, *Proc. ent. Soc. Lond.* 5 : 81–82).
- (37) The dates of publication of the various portions of Esper's *Ausl. Schmett.* can only be determined by reference to external sources. The ascertained dates should therefore be cited in square brackets. For the dates of this work, see Aurivillius, 1882, *K. sv. Vet. Akad. Handl.* 19 (5) : 182.
- (38) *Carcharodus* Hübner and *Spilothyrsus* Duponchel. (a) At the time of the

Lisbon Session it was believed that *Papilio fritillarius* Poda, 1761 (*Ins. Mus. graec.* : 79) was the oldest available name for the species which the Commission then decided to designate (under their plenary powers) as the type of *Carcharodus* Hübner and of *Spilothyrus* Duponchel, i.e. the species misidentified as *Papilio malvae* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) : 485, no. 167) by Denis & Schiffermüller in 1775 (*Schmett. Wien* : 159 no. A.1). It has since been ascertained that this identification of *Papilio fritillarius* Poda was erroneous and that the oldest available name for the species designated by the Commission as the type of *Carcharodus* Hübner and of *Spilothyrus* Duponchel is *Papilio alceae* Esper, [1780], *Die Schmett.* 1 (Bd. 2) *Forts. Tagschmett.* : 4 pl. 51 fig. 3 ♀. This is the name by which the species in question is usually known.

(b) The names *Papilio fritillarius* Poda, 1761, and *Papilio fritillum* [Denis & Schiffermüller], 1775, *Schmett. Wien* : 159 no. A. 3, both apply to the species commonly known as *Pyrgus carthami* (Hübner, [1808-1813]) (= *Papilio carthami* Hübner, [1808-1813], *Samml. europ. Schmett.* : pl. Pap. 143 figs. 720 ♂, 723 ♂ nec figs. 721-722). *Papilio fritillarius* Poda is the oldest available name for this species which must therefore in future be known as *Pyrgus fritillarius* (Poda, 1761). The type locality, like that of all the species first described by Poda in his *Ins. Mus. graec.*, is "Gratz".

(c) Now that it is known that *Papilio fritillum* [Denis & Schiffermüller], 1775, is a synonym of *Pyrgus fritillarius* (Poda) (= *carthami* Hübner), it is necessary to find another name for the South-European species of *Pyrgus* Hübner commonly known as *Pyrgus fritillum* (Schiffermüller, 1775), i.e. the species dealt with as *Hesperia fritillum* (Schiffermüller) by Warren in his revision of this group (1926, *Trans. ent. Soc. Lond.* 74 : 107-111 pl. 31 figs. 2, 4 (*genit.*), pl. 33, figs. 1-4 (*genit.*), pl. 36, figs. 1-4 ♂♂, 5 ♀). The oldest available name for this species is *Hesperia cirsii* Rambur, 1842, *Faun. ent. Andal.* 2 : 315 nota 4 pl. 8 figs. 12 ♂, 0 (*genit.*) and this species must therefore in future be known as *Pyrgus cirsii* (Rambur, 1842). The type locality of *cirsii* Rambur is "environs de Paris". From the point of view of subspecific nomenclature, the name *cirsii* Rambur applies to the same subspecies as that to which the name *fritillum* Schiffermüller has till now been erroneously applied.